

**Sacramento River Conservation Area  
Board of Directors  
Minutes**

February 28, 2002  
3:00 p.m.

Maxwell Inn  
Maxwell, Ca.

Chairman Ben Carter called the meeting of the Sacramento River Conservation Area to order at 3:05 p.m. at the above location. It was determined there was a quorum of (13) voting members present.

<u>County</u>	<u>Public Interest</u>	<u>Landowner</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Butte	Jane Dolan	Shirley Lewis	
Colusa	David Womble	Ben Carter	
Glenn	Denny Bungarz	Don Anderson	
Shasta	(Glenn Hawes)	(Dan Gover)	
Sutter	Dan Silva	Russell Young	
Tehama	Bill Borror	Brendon Flynn	
Yolo	Lynnel Pollock	Marc Faye	
Resources Agency			Mel Dodgin
Cal DFG			Diana Jacobs
State Reclamation Board			Pete Rabbon
USF&WS			(Marie Sullivan)
US COE			Mark Charlton
Cal DWR		(Dwight Russell)	Stacy Cepello
Bureau of Reclamation			Laura Allen

Names listed in parentheses represent absences

Also present an estimated audience of 145 interested persons

Manager Burt Bundy

Assistant Pat Brown, Recording Secretary

1. **Public Participation, Unscheduled Matters:** Chair Ben Carter announced that the California Department of Food & Agriculture has just signed the Memorandum of Agreement regarding the Sacramento River Conservation Area. Brendon Flynn noted there would be panel discussions on the recent developments concerning federal water allocations in the Klamath Irrigation Project and Central Valley Project arenas on March 6<sup>th</sup>. The 10:00 a.m. discussion will take place at the Heidrick Ag History Museum in Woodland and another at 6:00 p.m. at the CSU, Chico Memorial Farm Pavilion in Chico.
2. **Consent Calendar** - Don Anderson moved, seconded by Brendon Flynn to adopt the January 24, 2002 minutes. Motion passed by unanimous vote.
3. **Petition Request for Removal of Conservation Area Outer Boundary:** The Chairman noted the three options available to the Board (1) Retain existing boundary, adopt new agricultural definition of use language within the outer area, and focus restoration on the flood and erosion prone lands within the IRZ (2) Remove the outer boundary, focus restoration on the flood and erosion prone lands within the IRZ, clarify Handbook language to indicate the SRCA will continue to coordinate activities outside of the Inner River Zone related to

activities within the Inner River Zone (3) Remove the outer boundary outside the project levees, retain the outer boundary as currently defined upstream of the start of the project levees, focus restoration on the flood and erosion prone lands within the Inner River Zone, clarify Handbook language to indicate the SRCA will continue to coordinate activities outside of the Inner River Zone related to activities within the Inner River Zone. Open discussion followed and included the following excerpts:

- referred to the petitions presented at the last meeting with 400+ signatures; Reclamation districts have requested removal of boundary. Ask for a vote tonight.
- don't like the new term of agricultural conservation area; designation as "special area" makes it easier for activity down the road. Farmers, as stewards, want to pass on the title to the land as clear and unencumbered as possible. Should move cautiously, see how things proceed. Commend work of LAC; need assurances in place.
- Concern about large, woody debris, siltation; question the Board's understanding of the landowner concerns.
- slide presentation on problems caused by woody debris at different sites, including Sutter Bypass and Tisdale Weir; believe floodway is being diminished and that personal rights are at jeopardy.
- encourage getting landowner assurances in place as soon as possible. Threat to economic base when ag land converted to habitat. Need to look at cumulative effects of all programs, not just one. Map distributed to show Colusa area existing habitat and resultant economic impact.

Dan Martynn, NRCS, offered some clarification on the above map, noting that it was generated at the request of Colusa County showing habitat in Colusa County specific to the wetland reserve program (frequently flooded areas). The corridor on the map has nothing to do with the SRCA corridor; need to note the differences.

- statement at last meeting about lack of communication – feel Board is not listening to landowners
- reference was made to the letter from nine agencies supporting the Jan. 24 recommendation of the Executive Committee (signatories noted). Would like to move forward and start building trust.
- line makes people nervous; have doubts on the willing buyer concept
- noted turnout at this and previous meetings - should be no question should represent the people.
- landowner assurances can be demonstrated by reducing Conservation Area.
- spoke to importance of farming, tax base - loss of agricultural "factories" - cannot afford.
- no conservation area outside the levees, listen to counties.
- take exception to the option that has oversight on projects that relate to river.
- fear that policy of habitat restoration in floodway is putting public in harm's way.
- fear of repeat of Klamath Basin in this area.
- fear of property becoming a buffer zone. View as "land grab"

Following the public comment period the Chairman opened Board discussion on the three options. There was a concern noted that there has not been an opportunity to have discussion on option 3. It was moved by David Womble that the Board approve the removal of the outer boundary of the Conservation Area, confine it to the Inner River Zone, and direct the TAC to discuss language to make the Handbook conform, seconded by Dan Silva.

Discussion: It was noted the motion is similar to Option 2 with the exception of the phrase concerning activities related to the IRZ. Denny noted the requirements of bylaws concerning Board eligibility. A question was raised on the affect on the current Board makeup if the motion is passed; a

poll of the Board members indicated it would not impact the current Board composition. Bill Borrer, Tehama County, noted that most of the testimony today indicated land is going to be taken out of Ag. production; he did not feel that was the case, but that is the perception. He discussed a ground water issue that was resolved because all seven counties represented here worked together on retaining local ground water management, went to CALFED and were able to make a difference by working together.

There was a request for clarification on the “30,000” acres referenced in the Handbook. Burt Bundy explained that the 30,000 figure is the approximate number of acres in the area between Colusa and Red Bluff where the River is actively meandering (the inner river zone). The definition of the Inner River Zone in Reaches 1, 3 & 4 brings acreage to approximately 48 –50,000 acres. The 213,000 acres represents an area that was developed so that the SRCA could have oversight on projects in that outer river area that impact the inner river zone.

Bill Borrer moved to amend (first amendment) the original motion to leave the Conservation Area boundary as it is in Tehama and Shasta Counties, seconded by Brendon Flynn.

**(11-YES 2-NO 2-Absent)**. Motion passed to amend the original motion (first amendment)

There was a request for clarification on the number of acres in the inner river zone in Reach 4; the acreage is approximately 1928 acres in the inner river zone and approximately 47,000 acres in the outer river area.

Denny Bungarz noted that some of the efforts at Hamilton City were out of the Inner River Zone.

Denny moved to amend (second amendment) the original motion to include language that indicates the SRCA will continue to coordinate with activities outside of the inner river zone that relate to the inner river zone, seconded by Don Anderson.

Discussion: Large, private transaction took place recently, county had no chance to review. No authority at the local level on oversight; encourage Board to look at SRCA keeping that ability to look at projects.

**(9-YES 4-NO 2-Absent)** Motion passed to amend the original motion (second amendment)

Vote called for on Original Motion as amended. **(13 YES 2 Absent)** Motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### 4. Board Committee Reports -

- **Executive Committee** – Chairman Carter noted that the Legal Agreement has been reviewed by the Executive Committee, CSU, Chico Research Foundation, and the grant manager for CALFED. Jane Dolan moved, seconded by Brendon Flynn to enter in to this agreement regarding the retention of O’Laughlin & Paris to provide legal advice and services if needed. Motion passed by unanimous vote.
- **Landowners Assurances Committee** – The Chairman announced a draft Good Neighbor Policy is available for review and comment.
- **PILT/ECON** – Chairman Denny Bungarz announced the next meeting will be on March 7<sup>th</sup> at the Common Ground in Willows at 10:00 a.m. Because of time constraints he noted a written report is available on the February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- **Outreach Committee** – Laura Allen noted that the Outreach Committee is working on logo and brochure content, some of which has hinged on the action taken by the Board.

1. **Managers Report** – Burt discussed the Project Review process and the sample form that will be used for each project for conformity of information. There will be changes to it as move through the process. There was a suggestion that the township section and range and zoning

information should be added to the form. Brendon Flynn moved, seconded by Bill Borrer, that the Board approve the form with the suggested changes and provide the form to the agencies and private entities so they can start working with it as soon as possible. It was noted that the paper form would be used temporarily until it is available in electronic form; eventually the project information will be posted on a website. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

In light of the action taken today, there was a suggestion of a possible name change for the organization that would more accurately reflect its role. Some ideas were presented, i.e., Sacramento River Coordinating Council, Sacramento River Coordinating Forum; the suggestion was made that ideas and comments be emailed to the Board prior to the next meeting. The item would be on the March 28<sup>th</sup> agenda.

2. **Agency Reports:** Casey Walsh Cady from the Department of Food and Agriculture was introduced and mention was made again of their recent signing of the MOA. Mark Charlton, COE, informed the group that things are very tight this year on the federal side. The Reclamation Board and the COE are trying to build congressional support and interest in the Comprehensive Study and need to expand to state level also. Mark made available handouts on Fiscal Year 2003: Sacramento Valley Civil Works Program. Denny noted Section 205 funding has started at Hamilton City. Pete Rabbon, The Reclamation Board, expressed the hope that the same level of involvement shown tonight will continue with the work on the Good Neighbor Policy.
3. **Next Meeting** - March 28<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 p.m., location to be determined.

Meeting adjourned 5:20 p.m.